APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,494	04/09/2001	Maria Elena Delgado	032238.0003.UTL	8082

36183   7590   07/29/2004

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
P.O. BOX 919092
SAN DIEGO, CA 92191-9092

EXAMINER
BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/829,494	DELGADO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James H Blackwell	2176

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 April 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _1 9_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 January 2002* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/04/02*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 19 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 19 has a

claimed dependency on Claim 15, which seems to be in error. For purposes of

examination, the examiner assumed that Claim 19 dependent on Claim 16. Appropriate

correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 16-21, 25-27, 31-32, 39-40, and 44 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brandon et al. (hereinafter Brandon, U.S. Patent

No. 6,385,568).

In regard to independent Claim 1, Brandon teaches that the user receives an

email and a pop-up menu appears informing the user that the e-mail is translatable

using the Reader (Col. 16, lines 36-38; compare with Claim 1, *"... receiving original*

text in an original language in the e-mail message"). Brandon also teaches that the

Reader e-mail add-on module has detected that the incoming e-mail message has a

CCML component (Col. 16, lines 38-39). If the user selects to use a language reader,

the user is asked in which regional language version they would like to see the

translation. The CCML component is moved to the input buffer of the Reader and

automatically translated in Steps 5-10 (Col. 16, lines 45-49; compare with Claim 1, *"...*

translating the original text into translated text in a translated language"). Brandon

also teaches that the resulting translation is shown on the screen as if it was the original

message. Once read, the user is asked if they want to save the e-mail message as:

Translation only or Translation and Original Message. In either case, the CCML

component is always saved so that the message can be translated again in another

language or at another time in the same language (Col. 16, lines 51-58; compare with

Claim 1, ***"... displaying one or both of the original text and translated text in the e-***

mail message").

In regard to dependent Claims 2-5, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation

into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for

short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term

database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 2, *"... providing one or more text modification options for

selection by a user"* and Claim 3, *"... the one more text modification options

comprise one or more options from the group comprising spell check, special

language characteristics, direction of translation, authorship number, formal or

informal addressing and use of proper nouns"* and Claim 4, *"... modifying the

original text using the one or more text modification options"* and Claim 5, *"...

modifying the original text or the translated text"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 6, Brandon teaches that the unilingual meaning

editor (10) is supplemented with a memory (28) for storing meaning code data created

from a previous revision of the original text for the purposes of generating the meaning

code data for use with an automatic translation generator for a language or group of

languages (e.g. languages `Y`) different from the language or group of languages

corresponding to the language database (25) (e.g. languages `X`). A correspondence

database (27) between the two different destination languages is thus also provided and

the meaning code data (28) for the other language along with the correspondence table

data (27) is provided to parser 15 in order to provide on display (20) the input text (12)

already parsed and with meaning defined, inasmuch as there are common similarities

between the two destination languages (e.g. between `X` and `Y`) (Col. 7, lines 14-28;

compare with Claim 6, *"... re-translating the original text after modifying the*

original text or the translated text").

In regard to dependent Claim 10, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation

into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for

short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term

database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 10, *"... the step of modifying the original text or the translated*

text is accomplished by using the one or more text modification options").

In regard to independent Claim 11, Claim 11 recites the method steps of

translating text in an email message as claimed in Claims 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively,

and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 12, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation

into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for

short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term

database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 12, *"... the one or more text modification options comprise*

one or more options from the group comprising spell check, special language

characteristics, direction of translation, authorship number, formal or informal

addressing and use of proper nouns").

In regard to independent Claim 16, Brandon teaches that the user surfs the

Worldwide Web and finds a web page, which has the Icon identifying CCML files

displayed. If the user clicks on that icon, a pop-up menu appears informing the user that

this web page is readable using the CCML Reader. The Reader browser plug-in module

has detected that the current web page has an invisible CCML component. The user is

asked to select one of the following: To read the page in its original language; To read

the page in the language of their Reader. (If the user has several language readers, the

pop-up window would show them all). If the user selects to use a language reader, the

user is asked in which regional language version they would like to see the translation.

The CCML component is moved to the input buffer of the Reader and automatically

translated in Steps 5-10. The resulting translation is shown on the screen as if it was the

original page. All HTML tags for the original language are respected and retained: this

means that the translated text on the web page is formatted in exactly the same manner

as that of the original language (Col. 16, lines 45-50; compare with Claim 16, *"...*

displaying the web page; receiving original text in an original language in the web

page; translating the original text into translated text in a translated language;

and displaying original text and translated text in the web page").

In regard to dependent Claims 17-20, Brandon teaches a word-by-word

translation into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just

CCML for short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or

term database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 17, *"... the step of displaying the original text further*

comprises the step of providing one more text modifications options for selection

by a user" and Claim 18, *the one or more text modification options comprise one*

or more options from the group comprising spell check, special language

characteristics, direction of translation, authorship number, formal or informal

addressing and use of proper nouns" and Claim 19, *"... the step of receiving*

original text further comprises the step of modifying the original text" and Claim

20, *"... the step of translating the original text further comprises the step of*

modifying the original text or the translated text").

In regard to dependent Claim 21, Brandon teaches that the unilingual meaning

editor (10) is supplemented with a memory (28) for storing meaning code data created

from a previous revision of the original text for the purposes of generating the meaning

code data for use with an automatic translation generator for a language or group of

languages (e.g. languages `Y`) different from the language or group of languages

corresponding to the language database (25) (e.g. languages `X`). A correspondence

database (27) between the two different destination languages is thus also provided and

the meaning code data (28) for the other language along with the correspondence table

data (27) is provided to parser 15 in order to provide on display (20) the input text (12)

already parsed and with meaning defined, inasmuch as there are common similarities

between the two destination languages (e.g. between `X` and `Y`) (Col. 7, lines 14-28;

compare with Claim 21, *"... re-translating the original text after modifying the

original text or the translated text"*).

In regard to dependent Claim 25, Brandon teaches In the case of a HTML text for

a web browser, the input data format may include specifications as to text block position

and dimensions in order that such information may be passed on to the meaning code

data. As a consequence, the automatic translation generator 11 may have a module

integrated with the interpreter 30 for the purposes of automatically generating an HTML

output file which would resemble in layout and font style an original HTML file in the

original language. In the preferred embodiment, the X language database 35 and the

interpreter 30 may comprise the heart of a plug-in module to be integrated with a web

browser. In this case, the meaning code data 26 would be included in the downloaded

file to be viewed using a web browser (Col. 8, lines 22-36; compare with Claim 25, *"...*

the web page is in HTML or XML format").

In regard to independent Claim 26, Brandon teaches that the user surfs the

Worldwide Web and finds a web page, which has the Icon identifying CCML files

displayed. If the user clicks on that icon, a pop-up menu appears informing the user that

this web page is readable using the CCML Reader. The Reader browser plug-in module

has detected that the current web page has an invisible CCML component. The user is

asked to select one of the following: To read the page in its original language; To read

the page in the language of their Reader. (If the user has several language readers, the

pop-up window would show them all). If the user selects to use a language reader, the

user is asked in which regional language version they would like to see the translation.

The CCML component is moved to the input buffer of the Reader and automatically

translated in Steps 5-10. The resulting translation is shown on the screen as if it was the

original page. All HTML tags for the original language are respected and retained: this

means that the translated text on the web page is formatted in exactly the same manner

as that of the original language (Col. 16, lines 45-49; compare with Claim 26, *"...*

displaying the web page; receiving original text in an original language in the web

page; providing one or more text modification options; translating the original

text into translated text in a translated language; displaying the original text and

translated text; and modifying the original text or the translated text"). In addition,

Brandon teaches that the unilingual meaning editor (10) is supplemented with a memory

(28) for storing meaning code data created from a previous revision of the original text

for the purposes of generating the meaning code data for use with an automatic

translation generator for a language or group of languages (e.g. languages `Y`) different

from the language or group of languages corresponding to the language database (25)

(e.g. languages `X`). A correspondence database (27) between the two different

destination languages is thus also provided and the meaning code data (28) for the

other language along with the correspondence table data (27) is provided to parser 15

in order to provide on display (20) the input text (12) already parsed and with meaning

defined, inasmuch as there are common similarities between the two destination

languages (e.g. between `X` and `Y`) (Col. 7, lines 14-28; compare with Claim 25, *"…*

re-translating the original text into translated text in a translated language;

displaying the modified original text and translated text in the web page").

In regard to dependent Claim 27, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation

into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for

short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term

database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 27, *"... the one or more text modification options comprise*

one or more options from the group comprising spell check, special language

characteristics, direction of translation, authorship number, formal or informal

addressing and use of proper nouns").

In regard to dependent Claim 31, Brandon teaches In the case of a HTML text for

a web browser, the input data format may include specifications as to text block position

and dimensions in order that such information may be passed on to the meaning code

data. As a consequence, the automatic translation generator 11 may have a module

integrated with the interpreter 30 for the purposes of automatically generating an HTML

output file which would resemble in layout and font style an original HTML file in the

original language. In the preferred embodiment, the X language database 35 and the

interpreter 30 may comprise the heart of a plug-in module to be integrated with a web

browser. In this case, the meaning code data 26 would be included in the downloaded

file to be viewed using a web browser (Col. 8, lines 22-36; compare with Claim 31, *"...*

the web page is in HTML or XML format").

In regard to dependent Claim 32, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation

into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for

short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term

database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 26, *"... the step of modifying the original text or the translated*

text is accomplished by using the one or more text modification options").

In regard to independent Claim 39, Claim 39 recites most of the method steps of

translating text in an email message as claimed in Claims 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively,

and those method steps are rejected along the same rationale. Brandon does not

specifically teach *a browser-coupled to the means for providing the e-mail message and*

language translation. However, Brandon does teach both a mechanism for performing

email translations from within an email application and performing web page

translations from within a web browser making it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention that one could use the two interchangeably, providing the benefit of web access to email that can be translated.

In regard to dependent Claim 40, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome, its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28; compare with Claim 40, *"... one or more text modification options comprise one options special translation, authorship number, formal more from the group*

including spell checking, language characteristics, direction of informal

addressing and use of proper nouns").

In regard to dependent Claim 44, Claim 44 recites the method steps of

translating text in an email message as claimed in Claim 39, and is rejected along the

same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-9, 13-15, 22-24, 28-30, 33-38, 41-43, and 45-52 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandon.

In regard to dependent Claims 7 and 8, Brandon does not specifically teach that

the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish or that the

original language is Spanish and the translated language is English. However, Brandon

does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to

see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US

English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers:

Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always

change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines

40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for

each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 9, Brandon does not explicitly teach *sending the e-*

mail message to a recipient. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated email message to the recipient as a logical conclusion of the process of constructing and translating the email message, providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with people who read and understand a different primary language.

In regard to dependent Claims 13 and 14, Brandon does not specifically teach that the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish or that the original language is Spanish and the translated language is English. However, Brandon does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers: Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 15, Brandon does not explicitly teach *sending the e-mail message to a recipient*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated email message to the recipient as a logical conclusion of the process of constructing and translating the email message, providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with people who read and understand a different primary language.

In regard to dependent Claims 22 and 23, Brandon does not specifically teach that *the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish* or that *the original language is Spanish and the translated language is English*. However, Brandon does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers: Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 24, Brandon does not explicitly teach *sending the web page to a recipient*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated web page to the recipient as a logical conclusion of the process of constructing and translating the web page, providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with people who read and understand a different primary language.

In regard to dependent Claims 28 and 29, Brandon does not specifically teach that *the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish* or that *the original language is Spanish and the translated language is English*. However, Brandon does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US

English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers:

Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always

change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines

40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for

each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 30, Brandon does not explicitly teach *sending the*

e-mail message to a recipient. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated email

message to the recipient as a logical conclusion of the process of constructing and

translating the email message, providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with

people who read and understand a different primary language.

In regard to independent Claim 33, Claim 33 recites most of the method steps of

translating text in an email message as claimed in Claims 1, 2, 6, and 10, respectively,

and those method steps are rejected along the same rationale. Brandon does not

specifically teach *a server for providing the e-mail message*. However, it would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have assumed

that if one received an email message, that it would have been sent via an email or

some other compatible server, providing the benefit of sending and receiving text in a

standard manner. In addition, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time of invention to perform the text translation on a server, providing the

benefit of saving storage space on the client for the application and its associated files.

In regard to dependent Claim 34, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome, its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28; compare with Claim 34, *"The system of Claim 33, wherein the one or more text modification options comprise one or more options from the group including spell check, special language characteristics, direction of translation, authorship number, formal or informal addressing and use of proper nouns"*).

In regard to dependent Claims 35 and 36, Brandon does not specifically teach that *the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish* or that *the*

original language is Spanish and the translated language is English. However, Brandon does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers: Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 37, Brandon does not specifically teach that *the e-mail message including the original text and the translated text is sent to a recipient's mailbox coupled to the server.* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated email message to the recipient as a logical conclusion of the process of constructing and translating the email message, providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with people who read and understand a different primary language.

In regard to dependent Claim 38, Brandon does not specifically teach that the *text translation program comprises a translation data link library.* However, Brandon does teach that for every input or source language supported by the preferred embodiment, there is a unique Language Editor product. These may be sold over the Internet using electronic commerce transactions based on credit card processing. The Editor can be activated as an add-on to Microsoft's Word, Internet Explorer, Outlook,

Qualcast's Eudora, Netscape Communicator and Corel's WordPerfect software. In any of these settings, the Editor is activated from a windows pull-down menu (Col. 13, lines 9-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to assume that a likely mechanism to encompass one or more parts of the Language Editor, given the taught applications would have been to use DDL's providing the benefit of avoiding duplication of effort and storage space.

In regard to dependent Claims 41 and 42, Brandon does not specifically teach that *the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish* or that *the original language is Spanish and the translated language is English*. However, Brandon does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers: Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 43, Brandon does not specifically teach *the e-mail message including the original text and the translated text is sent to recipient's mailbox coupled to the means for providing the e-mail message and language translation*. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated email message to the recipient as a

logical conclusion of the process of constructing and translating the email message,

providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with people who read and

understand a different primary language.

In regard to dependent Claim 45, Brandon does not specifically teach that the

text translation program comprises a translation data link library. However, Brandon

does teach that for every input or source language supported by the preferred

embodiment, there is a unique Language Editor product. These may be sold over the

Internet using electronic commerce transactions based on credit card processing. The

Editor can be activated as an add-on to Microsoft's Word, Internet Explorer, Outlook,

Qualcast's Eudora, Netscape Communicator and Corel's WordPerfect software. In any

of these settings, the Editor is activated from a windows pull-down menu (Col. 13, lines

9-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to assume that a likely mechanism to encompass one or more parts of the

Language Editor, given the taught applications would have been to use DDL's providing

the benefit of avoiding duplication of effort and storage space.

In regard to independent Claim 46, Claim 46 recites the method steps of

translating text in an email message as claimed in Claim 33, and is rejected along the

same rationale.

In regard to dependent Claim 47, Brandon teaches a word-by-word translation

into meaning code, i.e. the Catome-to-Catome Meaning Language or just CCML for

short. Each word is compared to see if it matches a word in the Catome or term

database. The Catome is in fact a combination of both the term database and the

meaning database. If the word does not exist, a pop-up window appears offering the

user three choices: 1. Use the word as typed. It will appear untranslated to someone

reading the text with a Reader for a different language. 2. Change the word back in the

input window and re-submit the sentence. 3. Select the dictionary function and get a list

of words from the Catome with closely associated spelling, then choose the word that

you meant to type. If the word does exist, a pop-up window appears if the Catome has

several entries for that word. Listed in this window are each entry found in the Catome,

its part of speech (i.e. adjective, noun, verb etc.) and a close synonym to establish the

specific meaning of that entry in the Catome. The user selects the entry with the desired

meaning. Once all the words have been processed, the Editor prepares the CCML

equivalents for each translatable word, using the "Meaning Indicator" from the Catome

as the CCML value for each selected or unambiguous word (Col. 14, lines 2-28;

compare with Claim 47, *"... the one or more text modification options comprise

one or more options from the group including spell check, special language

characteristics, direction of translation, authorship number, formal or informal

addressing and use of proper nouns"*).

In regard to dependent Claims 48 and 49, Brandon does not specifically teach

that *the original language is English and the translated language is Spanish* or that *the

original language is Spanish and the translated language is English.* However, Brandon

does teach that the user is asked which regional language version they would like to

see their translations. For the English language the choices would be: UK English, US

English, Canadian English, Australian English. Similarly for French, the Reader offers:

Paris French, Quebec French, Belgian French, and Swiss French. The user can always change this regional language setting through a pop-up menu at any time (Col. 13, lines 40-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to translate between any two languages provided that the necessary files for each language were present, providing the benefit of global communication.

In regard to dependent Claim 50, Brandon does not explicitly teach *sending the e-mail message to a recipient's mailbox coupled to the server.* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to send the constructed and translated email message to the recipient as a logical conclusion of the process of constructing and translating the email message, providing the benefit of seamlessly communicating with people who read and understand a different primary language.

In regard to dependent Claim 51, Claim 51 recites most of the method steps of translating text in an email message as claimed in Claim 39, and is rejected along the same rationale. Brandon does not explicitly teach *a second computer coupled to the recipient's mailbox.* However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a second (or any other number) computer since one could have been accessing their email from another email (or web browser) client, providing the benefit of secondary access to one's email.

In regard to dependent Claim 52, Brandon does not specifically teach that the *text translation program comprises a translation data link library.* However, Brandon does teach that for every input or source language supported by the preferred

embodiment, there is a unique Language Editor product. These may be sold over the

Internet using electronic commerce transactions based on credit card processing. The

Editor can be activated as an add-on to Microsoft's Word, Internet Explorer, Outlook,

Qualcast's Eudora, Netscape Communicator and Corel's WordPerfect software. In any

of these settings, the Editor is activated from a windows pull-down menu (Col. 13, lines

9-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to assume that a likely mechanism to encompass one or more parts of the

Language Editor, given the taught applications would have been to use DDL's providing

the benefit of avoiding duplication of effort and storage space.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H Blackwell whose telephone number is 703-305-0940. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 703-305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
07/19/04

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER